

Northwest are going to derive that benefit which they ought to derive and which we hope they will derive from the construction and operation of this canal, it seems to me that it is desirable that the government should in some way have control of the tariff which is to be imposed by the owners of steamships upon the farmers of the Northwest, who would be sending their produce by vessels which pass through this canal. If there is company ownership, if the government will have as it would have, the right to control the rates which would be charged by the company, and if the government were to insist that the company which builds the canal shall also operate lines of steamers and barges between Fort William and Port Arthur and Montreal, and will control the tariff of these steamship lines and these barge lines which will be operated by the company, I think the government would be able to exercise an influence and a control in the interest of the producers of the west which it would not be possible to exercise if the canals were owned by the government, and if there was no control over the steamship lines and the barge lines which would be operating the canal system. That is one argument in favour, it seems to me, of company ownership. There is another argument in favour of company ownership, and it is that the building of this canal is going to develop an enormous amount of water-power. You will find at page XX of the report that the engineers are of the opinion:

That with a storage system as planned, and the tributary basins thereto required for the navigation project, a reliable water-power supply is secured at various dams amounting to 1,000,000 horse-power, which can be developed for about \$50 per horse-power.

If this canal were to be constructed by a company and the government were to assist the company by the guarantee of bonds or otherwise, it could be provided that the company must own and control the electric power which would be developed. The government would be able to exercise control over the company so far as the transmission and the utilization of that power would be concerned; they would be able to control the charges which the company would make for that power and that available water-power alone, one million horse-power, which would at least be worth \$5 per year when it was fully utilized, would in the future more than pay all the interest charges upon the bonds which would have to be issued for the purpose of securing the construction of the canal. I think if it were built by a private company it would be possible to control and keep within the control of the company and through the company under the con-

Mr. PUGSLEY

trol of the government, this enormous water-power to such an extent as would materially lessen the tolls which would be charged in respect to the use of the canal, and as would go very far towards meeting the annual interest burden on the bonds of the company. I do not say that I have made up my mind upon this question, but I simply desire to express the view that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the government securing the building of this canal, when the work is undertaken, by means of a strong company. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) who made a most admirable speech in submitting the resolution, intimated that if the government is not prepared to at once undertake the construction of this canal as a government work it ought to allow a company to undertake the work. If there were a company prepared to undertake the work without government assistance I would heartily concur in the view presented by my hon. friend. But do not let him be deceived, do not let the country be deceived in regard to that. The papers will show that there is no proposition from any company to-day offering to construct this work without government assistance; the proposals which have been made involve assistance by the government to a very large amount. Therefore the government, when it decides the time is ripe for the undertaking of this work, so far as regards any proposals which we have before us at present, will have to decide between engaging upon this work as a government work at a very large expenditure or incurring a very large obligation in order to induce a company to undertake the work. In either case the country will be involved in a very large liability, although I do not for a single moment undertake to say that the work is not of such magnitude and importance and that the work will not mean so much for the development of the Ottawa valley and our western country as to entirely justify the government in assuming the obligations which they will be called upon to assume, large though they may be.

Would my hon. friend intimate what papers he wishes to have brought down, as this project dates back for many years and very few papers have been brought down?

Mr. G. V. WHITE. My motion calls for papers not already brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend might send me a memorandum.

Mr. MONK. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that the Minister of Finance would announce the policy of the government.